

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated August 21, 2008 (hereinafter referred to as the “Office Action”). Upon entry of this paper and the amendments set forth herein, Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. In this paper, Applicants present amendments to Claims 1, 8 and 15 to clarify the distinctions over the prior art of record. Support for these amendments may be found in the Applicants’ Published Appl. No. 2005/0055555 at least at paragraphs [0016], [0019], and [0020]. For at least the reasons set forth in detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections of Claims 1-15

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5; 8, 9, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,714 (herein referred to as “Blakley”), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0022006 (herein referred to as “Bass”), and newly cited U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039940 (herein referred to as “Cox”). Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of Blakley, Bass, Cox, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0066037 (herein referred to as “Song”). Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of Blakley, Bass, Cox, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046410 (herein referred to as “Gusler”). Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of Blakley, Bass, Cox, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0111463 (herein referred to as “Amon”).

As summarized above, each rejection set forth in the Office Action is based primarily on the combination of Blakley, Bass and newly cited Cox. In the ‘Response to Arguments’ section of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the previous rejections

under §103 based on Blakley and Bass were withdrawn, and the new grounds of rejection summarized above are made in view of Cox.

Although the Examiner notes that the Applicants' previous arguments were considered and found persuasive, in the present Office Action, the Examiner maintains the assertion that "Bass teaches an interface component to receive a connection request including an identifier and entitlement information (URL of application, username and password)." (Office Action, page 3). In support of this contention, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0028] and [0029] of Bass. As noted in our previous response, in Bass, the user is required to provide his or her login information to the SiteMinder Web agent. (Bass, paragraphs [0028] and [0029]). When Bass is combined with Blakley in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the user must provide his or her login information in two separate instances in order to access a resource - the first user authentication occurs according to Blakley (i.e., the 'primary logon' described in column 5, lines 11-18 of Blakley), and the second user authentication occurs according to Bass (Bass, paragraph [0028] and [0029]).

In contrast to Blakley and Bass, Claims 1-15 as amended call for systems and methods wherein the user is required logon information only once – when authenticated by an authentication component. After authenticating the user, the authentication component acts as a liaison on behalf of the user and communicates the connection request to an interface component. (Applicants' Publication No. 2005/0055555, paragraph [0019]). In this regard, it is the authentication component that is authenticated by the interface component. (Applicants' Publication No. 2005/0055555, paragraph [0019]). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain the position that the combination of Blakley and Bass fails to describe or teach an interface component configured to receive an identifier identifying the authentication component and entitlement information associated with the user, as called for in Claims 1-15 of the present application. Furthermore, the present Office Action does not contend that Cox teaches an

interface component configured to receive an identifier identifying the authentication component and entitlement information associated with the user, and, as such, Cox fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies in the combined teachings of Blakley and Bass.

In addition, Applicants submit that Cox also fails to teach or suggest an interface component configured to compare an identifier identifying the authentication component with an expected identifier associated with the authentication component. Instead, Cox describes a data packet filtering system (i.e., a firewall) including a host processor and an accelerator processor. The host processor is configured to perform the data processing tasks in parallel with the accelerator's processing of the IP packets. (Cox, paragraph [0031]). The host processor controls the operation of the accelerator processor and manages the rulesets that are applied by the accelerator processor during packet filtering. (Cox, paragraph [0032]).

The paragraphs cited by the Examiner in support of the rejection of Claims 1-15 of the present application (Cox, paragraphs [0034], [0035], [0039] and [0041]) relate to the structure (i.e., linear rulesets and tree rulesets) and the manner in which the pre-defined rulesets are applied by the accelerator processor. In one example, the accelerator processor examines a packet received from a user seeking access to a resource, wherein the packet includes the user's Source IP address. (Cox, paragraph [0039]). The accelerator processor searches a tree ruleset by the user's Source IP address to determine the one or more rules associated with the received packet. (Cox, paragraph [0035]). As shown in Table 1 in paragraph [0039], the Source IP address is defined as the IP address of the original sender of the packet. In this regard, the accelerator processor and host processor of Cox are configured to allow or disallow individual packets of a communication sent by a user (i.e., the original sender of the packet) based on pre-determined rules related to the user. In contrast to Claims 1-15 of the present application, Cox does not compare an identifier identifying an authentication component with an expected identifier associated with the authentication component.

Moreover, in the Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly equates the ruleset in Cox with the ‘expected identifier associated with the authentication component’ of amended Claim 1. In Cox, packets are filtered according to rules associated with the user, without the involvement of an authentication component. In contrast, as called for in Claims 1-15 of the present application, the interface component compares the authentication component’s identifier with an expected identifier associated with the authentication component. As provided in the present application, “[s]ince the sign-on component 120 will have a known IP address, verification of the IP address can be accomplished by simply comparing the obtained IP address against the known IP address of the sign-on component 120.” (Applicants’ Published Appl. No. 2005/0055555, paragraph [0019]).

Cox requires a comprehensive and robust sets of rules to determine each user’s packet’s access rights, and fails to provide a description or teaching of an interface component configured to compare an identifier identifying an authentication component to an expected identifier associated with the authentication component, and if a match is found, provide entitlement information associated with the user (i.e., the originator of the connection request), as called for in Claims 1-15 of the present application.

Finally, Applicants submit that Cox teaches away from a combination with Blakley and/or Bass. In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that a combination of Bass and Blakley would “allow[s] secure access of resources to an authenticated user.” (Office Action, page 3). While this contention is refuted above, it illustrates the absence of a motivation to combine those references with Cox. If, as the Office Action asserts, Bass and Blakley result in authorized, secure access to the resources, then the packet filtering system/method of Cox would serve no purpose, and would be unnecessary. Put another way, having established authorized access to a resource according to the combination of Bass and Blakley suggested by the Examiner, there would be no need to conduct packet filtering according to Cox.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, it is clear that Blakley, Bass, and Cox, considered alone or in combination, fail to teach and/or describe the features recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 15, and all claims dependent thereon. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to establish that the deficiencies in the combined teaching of Blakley, Bass, and Cox are overcome by the remaining references cited by the Examiner in the Office Action (Song, Gusler, and Amon), which do not address and/or relate to the features recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 15.

In the event that any issues remain following entry of this Response, Applicants' attorney respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. Applicants ask that all correspondence related to this matter continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Daniel D. Sierchio/
Daniel D. Sierchio
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 53,591
Telephone: (973) 422-6422

Docket Administrator
Lowenstein Sandler PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 597-2500